

## RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation

### Verification - Independent Testing

#### Final Questions and Answers

---

#### Verification - Independent Testing

##### Section: 3.4.1

Topic: Development of Test Artifacts

Question #: 284

Question: Attachments B and C both identify Test Artifacts, Execution Results, Defects, and [Test Execution] Issues as deliverables, despite being listed under separately contracted activities. According to Section 3.4.1 (Page 18), the vendor providing Verification Services is responsible for "development and execution of various test artifacts". According to Section 3.4.2 (Page 19), the vendor providing Validation Services is responsible for "support for the development and execution of test artifacts". In the event that Verification Activities and Validation Activities are contracted to separate vendors, it is important to clearly delineate the expectations for each scope of work and specify the differences between the two activities' deliverables. Please advise.

Answer: The State expects verification and validation test artifacts to be developed and executed separately, as the two phases of testing have very different objectives and practitioners preparing and executing the artifacts. Please refer to Section 3.2, numbers 1 and 2 for clarification of the objectives.

The verification team (vendor) will develop and execute artifacts based on the defined requirements. The Validation team (State business people with help from the Validation vendor) will develop and execute the validation artifacts based on business needs.

Where appropriate to do so, the State expects some verification artifacts to be reused in Validation to expedite Validation, and to remove certain technical obligations from the business team. Although this is especially true if the award for both service components is to the same vendor, the State expects cooperation between the two teams regardless.

Topic: Testing Applications for independent testing

Question #: 312

Question: The successful bidder will be responsible for providing independent intergration testing services covering all application systems..." On page 15 Cost Proposal, "the bidder is required to supply: Hardware and licensed software including test tools and software maintenance." Will the IV&V vendor be required to create a separate testing environment or implement a separate testing tool application?

Answer: The State will acquire all hardware and licensed software in use on this Project. An exception to this rule is any dedicated software used by a single vendor only within that vendor's environment and for use only by that vendor.

An Amendment to the IV&V will be issued removing this requirement from any/all IV&V vendors. The State does expect that currently installed software licenses (e.g., for Segue, TeamTrack, ClearCase, et al.) will be expanded unless the State agrees otherwise in writing before any new acquisition.

The verification and validation vendor(s) are each required to establish a separate test environment within the hardware and operations software provided by the State. Where reusable, deliverables are expected to be shared between these environments, e.g., database loading scripts.

## **RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**

### **Verification - Independent Testing**

#### **Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Clarification of Verification timeframes

Question #: 313

Question: Attachment B Ref #4 Requirements Review - We all agree that requirements are critical to any project. The one month time frame is very aggressive. The notes states that "the schedule for this activity may be accelerated to occur earlier than other IV&V activities". What exactly does this mean? Will the due date for other activities (Verification, Validation and Audit) be delayed or just other Verification activities be delayed?

Answer: The requirements for this Project are laid out in the DDI RFP, primarily in Sections 5, 7, 8 and 9. The State went to great lengths and considerable expense to identify the requirements it needs now and in the future, and not just a recitation of what the current systems support.

Since this IV&V RFP was drafted, the State has more actively explored the possibility of using the Program Office vendor earlier in the Project (ca. October 2005), in part to import the requirements into the requirements management (RM) tool (planned to be Borland's Caliber/RM), normalize the requirements, allocate the appropriate requirements to software, work with our business team to develop an initial prioritization of the requirements, and have a requirements baseline ready for DDI contract negotiations and the start of the project. We are also looking at an early start for other Program Office activities as well, e.g., getting the incident management procedures finalized and the tool operational. The other IV&V activities will start with the rest of the Project in January 2006.

This approach allows the "1 month" period (aggressive though it may be) during start-up to be used by ALL vendors to formally agree upon the requirements baseline, and to develop the build strategy and schedule.

Topic: Coordination of testing efforts

Question #: 315

Question: Attachment B Ref. #10 Test Artifact Development and Execution – The description states "Develop and execute test runs.....". Does this mean that the Verification team will work with Medical Services to manage the testing efforts for all vendors?

Answer: The Verification team will use the business team as a resource primarily for resolving issues, although other needs may become apparent. The State expects the Verification Team to prepare and execute all test artifacts in the Verification phases using the defined requirements as the basis for all test planning.

The objective of the Verification effort, as described in Section 3.2, number 1, page 17 of the IV&V RFP is to "assure that the software developed by other bidders...performs according to specifications and requirements."

The business team has their own significant responsibilities in the Validation efforts to assure that the "specifications and requirements" are truly what the business needs now and into the planned future, and that requisite changes to business policies, processes and procedures have been effected.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Verification - Independent Testing**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Independent Testing

Question #: 333

Question: Are IV&V vendors required to replicate the architecture/hardware/telecommunications/software/applications etc. of the MMIS replacement system components to perform independent testing or will the IV&V vendor be given access to the DDI vendor platform to complete independent testing? Are the DDI vendors required to provide unlimited access by the IV&V vendors to the DDI test regions/facilities?

Answer: All IV&V activities will be conducted on State owned and operated hardware and infrastructure. The State assumes, as an IV&V "best practice", that those IV&V test activities will replicate the planned production environment as closely as is appropriate and possible.

The IV&V vendor(s) will have ownership and control over their respective environments, and will have responsibility for maintaining that environment as is appropriate to support their efforts, e.g. key database backups to allow quick recovery in the event of a serious defect, database loading through the test scripting tool, etc.

Topic: Due Date of Project Schedule Integration

Question #: 338

Question: What overall project schedule is Item 1 of Attachment B referring to, the overall including all DDI schedules and IV&V schedules?

The due date for this item states 1 month after the beginning of the IV&V contract. If overall is inclusive of DDI schedules, please revise due date.

Answer: Please refer to the answer to question #339 for the answer to the first part of this question.

An IV&V RFP Amendment will be issued changing the due date to read "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of all Project contracts".

Topic: Verification Integration timing

Question #: 340

Question: Attachment B Ref. #1 Project Integration - The planned due date as "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of the IV&V contract" the same task in Attachment C Ref #1 has the planned due date as "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of all Project contracts". Are these task to start at the same time, and if so when is that? With this due date, the Verification integration will be done prior to the contracts for development being awarded, so the project schedule will be uncertain

Answer: Please refer to the answer to question #338.

Topic: Clarification of issues reporting

Question #: 342

Question: Attachment B Ref #2 Identification of Issues – Does this mean the Verification team will report on all issues or just the issues that impact the Verification effort?

Answer: The requirement is for the Verification team to document all issues it encounters during its verification efforts, and to be current with the resolution of any issue that impacts the Verification team's schedule.

## RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation

### Verification - Independent Testing

#### Final Questions and Answers

---

Topic: Cross-over strategy clarification request

Question #: 343

Question: Attachment B Ref. #7 Testing Crossover - The description indicates that a logical point should be defined to move the testing from the vendor to ND ITD. The deliverable is a Cross-over Strategy. A strategy involves more than a cross-over point. The new system may involve new technology. Will this be part of the strategy?

Answer: This requirement is for the Verification vendor to work with the State's ITD to determine how far into an interface the vendor must execute the tests, and at what point the ITD staff will pick up the responsibility for testing that specific interface into the State's other systems.

This requirement does NOT address the hand-off of all testing activities and artifacts from the vendor to the State at the conclusion of this Project. This kind of "end of Project" activity will be defined by the IV&V vendor(s) as part of their respective Strategies.

Topic: Software - general

Question #: 350

Question: There are several tools identified in the RFP such as Segue (pg 37 Attachment B Item 12); Caliber/RM (pg 42 Attachment E Item 2; Serena TeamTrack (pg 42 Attachment E Item 3); ClearCase (pg 42 Attachment E Item 6). Is the IV&V responsible to secure this software or will the DHS provide copies?

Please provide a compiled list of software the IV&V vendor is required to use.

Answer: The State either currently licenses or is in the process of licensing all software referenced in this question. The IV&V vendors are expected to use the referenced software.

Each vendor does have limited latitude, however, to recommend other products that help them and/or Program Management achieve our goals for this Project. For example, if the MMIS vendor has a significant investment in a regression test bed using, for example, IBM's Rational SQA/Manager and Robot, the State is prepared to consider the use of that regression test bed using a non-specified tool.

Similarly, if the Verification or Validation vendor has significant experience using, for example, Mercury WinRunner and/or QuickTest in a similar technical environment as is planned for this Project, Program Management will consider the use of that product. The State currently has very limited licenses for Segue's products although it is the "preferred" tool as defined by the State's Enterprise Architecture group. As the delivered verification and validation artifacts represent the regression test bed for the Medicaid systems for the future, the State does expect that both efforts will use the same tool(s).

The other products referenced are for use across all vendors, and will allow Program Management to more easily manage and report from the multi-vendor environment. Therefore, Program Management will not be likely to change these products at this time, unless a compelling business case is made to do so.

#### Section: 4

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Verification - Independent Testing**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Project Integration Deliverables

Question #: 316

Question: For the Project Integration deliverables for the Verification vendor, the listed due date is "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of the IV&V contract". Under the similar activity for the Validation vendor, the listed due date for these deliverables is "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of all Project contracts". In the latter case, we interpret this due date as being dependent upon the start of the MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW contracts. Should the same activity for the Verification vendor have had the same language, or is it correct as written?

Answer: An IV&V RFP Amendment will be issued changing the due date to read "1 month after the beginning of the start-up phase of all Project contracts".

## **RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**

### **Audit - Project audit services**

#### **Final Questions and Answers**

---

#### **Audit - Project audit services**

##### **Section: 2.1**

Topic: Proposal Due Date - general

Question #: 305

Question: Considering the State plans on issuing answers to questions 7/26, the vendor need to have the answers to complete their proposals, and the lead time vendors need to produce and ship their proposals, whould the State please consider extending the proposal due date by at least a week to provide for sufficient time for vendors to address answers to questions in their proposals.

Answer: An amendment the the IV&V RFP will be issued to extend the due date for the bid proposals. This will also necessitate a revision to all subsequent dates in the IV&V RFP schedule as well, although the Medicaid Systems Project start date of 1/3/06 will not change

##### **Section: 2.2**

Topic: Partial Award - General to all Compnents

Question #: 274

Question: Please clarify what a partial award is. Is this award of less than 4 service components or something other?

Answer: A partial award is to award one or more but not all of the service components to one vendor, and other service components to one or more other vendors. Thus, each vendor has part of the total award.

Topic: Proposal format specifications

Question #: 298

Question: Are there additional specifications for size or format of the proposals? Page size is listed but no information on font restrictions, margins, number of pages.

Answer: No other restrictions or requirements for the proposal are specified. Use your best judgement on the proposal using industry accepted marketing and documentation standards and guidelines.

##### **Section: 2.3**

Topic: Number of Proposals Required - General

Question #: 296

Question: We are unclear of the number of searate proposals required.

The Cover Letter states " Bidders may offer Bid Proposals for any and all service components, but each individual system component's Bid Proposal must be self contained and submitted searately according to the submittal requirements described by this RFP."

Are there a max of 4 separate proposals required, one each for verification services, validation services, audit services, and PO services OR max of 12, one each for previous named services for each of the system components MMIS, Pharmacy POS, and DW or something other?

Please clarify.

Answer: The State expects no more than 4 proposals from any vendor, one for each of the IV&V service components. Each proposal will address, as appropriate, how the vendor intends to address the needs of the entire Medicaid System Project (MSP) for that service component.

We would expect that the Program Office and Audit proposals will not need to address the specifics of each of the MSP sub-systems, as these services are more global in nature.

## **RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**

### **Audit - Project audit services**

#### **Final Questions and Answers**

---

##### **Section: 2.3.4**

Topic: Bidding on all services requested

Question #: 297

Question: Is it necessary to submit four separate proposals when bidding on all the services requested?

Answer: Yes. Due to the inherent risks associated with this Project, the State is interested in selecting the best possible IV&V solution. This may require the use of multiple vendors to satisfy the IV&V requirements. Therefore, the State needs to be able to review proposals from each of the vendors by service component.

Topic: Define Separate Proposals - General

Question #: 301

Question: Please clarify what constitutes a "self-contained separate proposal" stated in Cover Letter? Section 2.3.4 states "For each service for which the bidder is submitting a proposal, the proposed solution will have the following sections: Executive Summary and Project Approach and Management."  
Does this mean that if a bidder were submitting proposals for all service components that they submit 1 cover letter, 1 table of contents, 1 bidder qualifications, and 1 proposed solution consisting of the executive summary and proposed approach and management sections for each component?  
Please clarify what needs to be packaged together in self contained packages and what identifying information they should be labeled.

Answer: Because the State will evaluate proposals by service component, it is necessary to have the vendor information with each proposal. We know that this is duplicate information but it should be a simple matter of photocopying the corporate information from the original.

Topic: Cost at task level - general

Question #: 325

Question: "Identification of time and cost at the task level" is required for the project schedule. This is in contradiction with 2.2 pg 9 1st paragraph under Proposal Submission Deadline and Packaging which states "Bidders must ensure no reference to cost is made in part (a) bidder and proposed solution". Please clarify.

Answer: The intent is to divide the total costs from the work proposed so that the reviewers for the technical solution are not influenced by the cost. Due to the potential for a reviewer to "do the math" and total the charges, the IV&V RFP Amendment will change this requirement to make the costs optional in the schedule.

##### **Section: 2.3.5**

Topic: Cost Proposal Requirements -General

Question #: 304

Question: Is a separately sealed cost proposal required for each service component or is only one cost proposal containing all Attachments B through E required if the bidder proposing for all service components?

Answer: As noted in the response to other questions, the review of the proposals will be by service component. Also, costs will be reviewed by a separate review committee. Therefore, the cost proposals must be submitted separately.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Audit - Project audit services**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: DHS Incident Mangement Tool & Procedures

Question #: 319

Question: Attachment B #2 & #3 pg 36, Attachment C #3 pg 38, and Attachment D #4 pg 40 all refer to the "DHS Incident Mangement procedure and tool, or process". Is there is an existing tool, procedures and process that the IV&V vendor must use? If, so please provide a description of this tool and process.

Answer: A draft procedure has been written, and will be completed during the initial Program Office activities of this Project. It is our intent to acquire the Serena TeamTrack product for all incident management; that acquisition is in process at this time.

The incident management processes are different for each type of incident: issue, change or defect, although there is a common set of information collected for all. Issues and defects will be single-threaded, i.e., assigned to one owner at any given time until resolved. Changes will be multi-threaded, i.e., routed to all Team Leaders (vendor and State) for review and estimation of impact simultaneously.

The Program Office will rigorously monitor, manage and control all incidents until resolved, with specific process steps, and automatic changes in defined states and status changes at each step in the process.

**Section: 3.1**

Topic: Builds - general

Question #: 326

Question: How many builds does DHS esitimate each system component (MMIS, Pharmacy POS, DW) to include?

Answer: The specific number of builds will be determined during the start-up activities of the DDI Phase of the Project. The stipulation in the DDI RFP (page 288) is for "Numerous and frequent deliveries of software (i.e., builds) for verification and validation purposes." Further, that RFP also states that it is the State's preference that such builds are "at least monthly" when practical. In some cases, the build strategy MAY see as much as three months between build deliveries, but these will be rare due to the risks to the Project.

Each build will be an defined integration of requirements from any/all appropriate Medicaid components, as determined by all vendors (including IV&V), and State teams (Program Management, Business, ITD) during the planning activities.

Note that the State expects some distinction between traditional Medicaid components (e.g., MMIS, POS, DSS) to blur as the MITA model is implemented in ND.

**Section: 3.4.1**

Topic: Interfaces

Question #: 329

Question: What are the interfaces current and future for MMIS, DW & POS to interface with? Will the interfacing entities modify to accept or receive new data from a new MMIS/DW/POS or must the new MMIS/DW/POS conform to current interface specifications?

Answer: Interfaces are defined in some detail in the DDI RFP. Note that interfaces for the purposes of this Project are defined as bi-directional communications only. One-way data flows into and out of the current MMIS environment are labeled as Inputs and Outputs.

Since the new Medicaid systems environment will not replicate the current architecture, any existing interfaces (a) may be abolished, or (b) will be re-written to accomodate the new environment. Further, new unspecified interfaces may be necessary as well. Development of interfaces (and inputs from and outputs to other State systems) are the responsibility of the State's IT Department to develop as a part of this Project.



**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Audit - Project audit services**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

**Section: 3.4.2**

Topic: Attachment C Item 8 Truncate

Question #: 348

Question: Attachment C Item 8 Detailed Description - cell truncates. Please identify remaining text not fully displaying

Answer: Item 8 is continued at the top of the following page; there is no omitted text. It reads in its entirety:

"Assistance to Medical Services in reviewing departmental policies, processes and procedures applicable to the use and operation of the new MMIS system; and implementing any needed changes to these items."

**Section: 3.4.3**

Topic: Vendor Deliverable Review and Auditing

Question #: 283

Question: Section 3.4.1, Page 18 of the RFP states that Verification Activities will include "review of key project deliverables to identify and prioritize testable requirements". Section 3.4.3, Page 19 of the RFP states that Audit Activities will include "identification of the key project deliverables and processes to be audited" and "conducting audits and tracking identified issues to resolution". Attachment C (Validation Activities), Page 39 of the RFP identifies "Reviewed Deliverables" as a responsibility under the Project Support activity. In the event that Verification Activities, Validation Activities, and/or Audit Activities are contracted to separate vendors, it is important to confirm which vendor is responsible for review and recommendations regarding the acceptance of the MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW vendors' deliverables. Please advise.

Answer: Program Management will use all available information from as many sources as it feels are necessary to determine whether to accept or reject DDI deliverables.

In the cases noted above, there are different intents for the reviews:

3.4.1, pg. 18: the review is to identify testable requirements

3.4.3, pg. 19: the review is to determine detailed audit scope

Attachment C, pg. 39: "reviewed deliverables" is the output of the process, e.g., reviewed incidents, reviewed DDI deliverables, etc.

Topic: Wording clarification in Audit Services

Question #: 295

Question: Should the second paragraph say "In general, these audit activities..." instead of "In general, these validation activities..."?

Answer: The statement in 3.4.3, page 19 is changed from "In general, these validation services will include:" to "In general, these audit services will include:"

Topic: MITA analysis coordination

Question #: 306

Question: Attachment D "The vendor will begin by creating a report that analyzes the applicability and impacts of the MITA concept to the MMIS replacement project." Is this activity independent from the Replacement RFP's MITA Deliverable 8.4.1.2 #5?

Answer: The auditor(s) will produce an independent MITA assessment, separate from the DDI vendor's assessment. This independent assessment will provide a check and balance to the DDI vendor's review and report.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**

**Audit - Project audit services**

**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: MITA Initial report scope clarification

Question #: 307

Question: What level of detail is expected in the MITA initial report?

Answer: Since the MITA model is currently still being expanded by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), detail in all areas is not possible. The intent of this review and report is to provide an independent assessment of the planned direction (MITA compliance), and to have the Auditor(s) raise any specific issues that the compliance may have for the project, as well as any missteps or omissions by the State or vendor in complying with the MITA model.

Topic: MITA orientation for project members

Question #: 308

Question: Is any training or outreach planned to educate project team members about MITA?

Answer: No. Current State project team staff has received training on MITA.

All vendors are expected to familiarize themselves re' MITA. Information on the MITA direction, architecture and future plans may be found at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) website, <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/medicaid/mmis/mita.asp>.

Per the RFP, the Auditor(s) is required to present Program Management with any changes and updates to MITA, and assess impact to the Project.

Topic: MITA maintenance

Question #: 309

Question: Attachment D: "The vendor will also provide DHS with updates based on changes to the MITA document on an ongoing basis ... and will document MITA changes." Who is the DHS Medical Services staff member responsible for maintaining the MITA self-assessment, transition plan, etc?

Answer: The Auditor(s) will provide the State's Program Manager with any pertinent MITA information or changes. The Program Manager will direct the Program Office staff to maintain the appropriate MITA-related documents, and issue any necessary incidents as required.

Topic: Test Results Assessment

Question #: 347

Question: Attachment D Item 6 is assessment of test results, test results from all testing - DDI vendor unit & system testing; IV&V Verification Testing & Validation UAT testing? Please clarify.

Answer: The Auditor(s) is expected to audit all testing efforts by the DDI contractors. This is due to the fact that much of this testing will be conducted "behind the scenes" by the contractor(s), i.e., not directly controlled by the Medicaid Project. IV&V activities will involve State staff and thus will be more visible to Program Management.

However, the Program Manager reserves the right to have the Auditor(s) address any IV&V efforts if there is perceived risk or other issue.

**Section: 3.7**

## **RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**

### **Audit - Project audit services**

#### **Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Invoice Submittal

Question #: 314

Question: It is stated in section 3.7 "The bidder must submit the final invoice for payment to DHS no later than 45 days after acceptance of the final deliverable by DHS." Attachment F, Item III states "Final payment requests will be submitted to the State no later than thirty (30) days after the expiration of this agreement." For deliverables that are on-going and may be submitted right up through the expiration of this agreement, is the DHS committed to completing review and approval within 25 days to allow for invoice submittal within 30 days?

Answer: The quoted reference to Section 3.7 refers only to the final invoice at the end of the Project. Attachment F is only a template for the standard State service contract. The specific terms of this contract will be informally negotiated during Oral Presentations, BAFO, and formally during contract negotiations.

The vendor has 30 days after completion of deliverable in which to prepare and issue the invoice. The State is committed to review deliverables as quickly after delivery as possible, but may, in some cases require some time to review completely.

The specification for State payment (Section 2.2, page 11) up to 30 days after receipt of an invoice is, per Section 3.7 (page 24) subject to our review and the 80/20 rule.

#### **Section: 4**

Topic: Contractor Audit Reports Deliverables

Question #: 337

Question: For the "Contractor Audits" task for the Audit Activities vendor, the Audit Reports deliverables show a Planned Due Date of "Weekly and Monthly Status Reports". Is it DHS' intent for these Audit Reports (which review & monitor the MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW contractors' work plans) be submitted as part of the Weekly/Monthly Status Reporting responsibility or are these Audit Reports more aptly defined as monthly, ongoing, independent deliverables? Also, should the successful Audit Activities contractor plan on submitting its first Audit Report within 1 month of the commencement of the DDI contracts (approximately February 2006)?

Answer: Each Project Team (including Audit) is expected to produce their own weekly status and monthly management reports. Should audit activities not be planned for a specific period, as agreed upon by Program Management, then the Auditor's weekly status report for that week would indicate no planned activities.

Reports of audits conducted will be issued at the conclusion of the audit, and will not wait for issuance of a status report.

The initial start up activities include planning on the part of the Auditor(s) to determine what will be audited and the frequency/schedule (Ref #1 and 2 in Attachment D). The State expects planned audit reports to occur after this schedule is complete.

During the planning activities in the DDI start-up phase, if the Auditor(s) observe or otherwise note significant variances, the Auditor's function is to bring these ad hoc issues to the attention of the Program Manager. This is true throughout the Project, and not just during the planning activities.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

**Project Office - Support services for project management**

**Section: 1.6.16**

Topic: Contract Provision Objections

Question #: 355

Question: It states any objection to the standard contract provisions are to be set out in the bidder proposal. Where in the proposal should these be included? Cover Letter?

Answer: Placing such objections in the Cover Letter is acceptable. Such objections, should there be more than 1 or 2, may also be provided in a separate attachment to the cover letter.

**Section: 1.6.6**

Topic: COI Disclosure

Question #: 356

Question: Where should potential conflict of interest disclosures be included in proposal?

Answer: Although not specifically addressed in the Proposal Format, any optional information, such as a potential or real conflict of interest, is to be included in a new Section(s) after the Table of Contents and before the Bidder Qualifications.

**Section: 2.1**

Topic: Schedule for Orals

Question #: 357

Question: Oral Presentations are scheduled during the same timeframe as the annual MMIS conference. Would ND consider changing the anticipated schedule so vendor staff can participate in both if necessary.

Answer: The amendment being prepared for the IV&V RFP will move the Oral Presentations to late August, beginning approximately one week after the conclusion of the MMIS Conference.

**Section: 2.2**

Topic: Payment for Consulting Services

Question #: 275

Question: General Question - Under the "Payment" section of Section 2.2, Page 11, the RFP states that "the final negotiated cost will not be exceeded". Since the RFP also asks bidders to propose a rate for ongoing consulting services (Section 2.3.5, Page 14), we assume that this statement excludes any additional services which the State chooses to have a successful bidder perform. Please confirm the accuracy of this assumption.

Answer: The intent of the consulting rate is to provide the State with a billing rate for any services we may request of a vendor that are not included in the scope of this RFP.

Topic: Submission Deadline

Question #: 288

Question: General Question - The RFP cover letter states that the proposal is due by 3:00 p.m. on August 2. RFP Section 2.2, Proposal Submission Deadline and Packaging, Page 9, gives time as no later than 4:00 p.m. What is the correct deadline for submission?

Answer: The RFP overrides the Cover Letter, therefore the correct time is 4PM CT on August 2.

**Section: 2.3.5**

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation  
Project Office - Support services for project management  
Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: IV&V staff travel within North Dakota

Question #: 299

Question: How much travel is anticipated to project-related meetings in North Dakota away from Bismarck?

Answer: The State currently envisions minimal, if any, travel away from Bismarck.

Topic: Software licenses

Question #: 328

Question: Will the chosen vendor be required to provide software licenses for tools other than Test Management, Functional Test Automation, or Performance testing such as Software Configuration Management or will they utilize available licenses from the State?

Answer: The State already has licenses for configuration management, requirements management and (soon) incident management tools. These tools will be used by all vendors and State staff on this Project.

If approved by the State, any other software proposed by the IV&V vendor for use on this Project will be acquired by the State directly from the software vendor.

Topic: Cost Requirements General

Question #: 352

Question: With separate cost proposals for each service, costs such as fax, shredder, travel for staff to ND cannot be leveraged as if one IV&V vendor providing all services. For example in doing a separate bid for each service a vendor may have a staff person completing a task for 2 days during the week for one service and completing a task for another service 3 days during the same week.

Considering that a separate vendor may be selected for each service, should the cost of traveling to/from ND be included in each when in reality if the same vendor selected for both services, they would only incur the cost once? Does ND anticipate this type of situation to escalate their overall IV&V cost?

Answer: The vendor will need to state in their bid and cost proposals that such "duplicate" costs (i.e., common costs documented in each cost proposal) will be charged one time only if that vendor is awarded multiple service components.

The RFP stipulates that costs are to be identified "for each project deliverable and will be inclusive of any related expenses". Therefore the vendor will have to provide costs for each project deliverable/activity in the Attachments B through E (a) if awarded just one service component, and (b) also if awarded other service components. The vendors are urged to be creative in presenting this information in an easily understood manner to the State.

Cost escalation is seriously frowned upon by the State and this Project.

**Section: 2.4**

Topic: Evaluation

Question #: 276

Question: General Question - Please confirm that each serviceline (e.g., Verification Services, Validation Services, Project Office Services, and Audit Services) will be evaluated independently from one another, each following the 80% "Proposed Solution" and 20% "Cost Proposal" evaluation model.

Answer: Each service component (Verification Services, Validation Services, Program Office Services, and Audit Services) will be evaluated independently from one another, both for the technical and the cost proposals.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Evaluation Points

Question #: 277

Question: General Question - Section 2.4, Page 15 of the RFP identifies that proposals will be graded on an 80% "Proposed Solution" and 20% "Cost Proposal" basis, but does not identify the total available evaluation points for each of the 4 services requested. Please clarify.

Answer: Please refer to the answer given to question #300.

Topic: Evaluation points

Question #: 300

Question: What is the breakdown of the evaluation points for this proposal?

Answer: The breakdown is as follows:

Section	Available Points	
Executive Summary, Introduction, & Project Understanding		50
Services Overview	50	
Corporate Experience & Qualifications		150
General Requirements	50	
Verification Activities	250	
Validation Activities	250	
Audit Activities	250	
Project Office Activities	250	
Total	1300	

If a vendor only bids on selected components, e.g. verification and validation but not Program Office or Audit, then the total will be reduced by the number of points for the service components not bid upon. In the example given, the total would be reduced by 500 (250 each for Audit and Program Office), resulting in a total of 800 maximum points. The total awarded would be noted as a percentage of the total maximum as a part of the scoring methodology and the scoring tool.

**Section: 3.4.1**

Topic: Governance Team dedication to project

Question #: 302

Question: Will any of the Project Management or Project Oversight teams be fully devoted to the IV&V activities and/or the Replacement project?

Answer: The State's governance structure includes a Steering Committee, Program Sponsor, Program Director, and Program Manager. In addition, the State will also have a dedicated Business Team reporting to the Program Manager and available to all vendor teams as resources. These resources will be shared across all project activities; no State staff is currently planned to be allocated to support a single Project function only, although this may change due to the demands of this Project.

**Section: 3.4.2**

Topic: Deliverable due date

Question #: 359

Question: Attachment C Item 6 has a deliverable due date as 1 month from start yet all are on-going deliverables. Please clarify.

Answer: The "Planned Due Date" for Validation artifacts is "Ongoing".

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

**Section: 3.4.4**

Topic: Location of project teams

Question #: 303

Question: How close will the IV&V Team location be to the IT facilities? Medical Services staff? MMIS, POS, DSS/DW contractors locations?

Answer: All Project staff, including vendor teams, State IT Dept. staff, business team and Program Management will be co-located in a facility specifically allocated solely to this Project. This facility is not located on the grounds of the State Capital but is within the Bismarck city limits.

Topic: DHS Network Resource access

Question #: 310

Question: What are the remote access policies for DHS and other state computer based resources? Is virtual private network access allowed to share drives, applications? Is email available through web access in addition to being on the state system?

Answer: Remote access is allowed under State policies. The specific requirements for remote work must be specified by the vendor in their proposals, and approved by the Program Manager for this Project. Since this Project has gone to some expense to secure a dedicated Project facility, and due to the benefits of co-location, the Project expects the vendors to conduct as much of their efforts on-site in Bismarck

VPN is one technology in use. Access to web-based email is also available, depending on the user's ISP and email provider.

Topic: Remote access to project library

Question #: 311

Question: Will project team members be able to access the project library remotely?

Answer: The Project Library (PL) will reside on secure State servers and will not be available to general Web users. The State expects that some measure of security (LDAP, Active User, etc.) will need to be implemented for the PL, and thus the PL may be available to project team members remotely. If this is a requirement by a vendor, that vendor should so state in their proposal.

Topic: state staff in PO

Question #: 330

Question: What key staff positions does DHS intend to provide, with staff staff, as part of the project office

Answer: The Program Office is currently planned to include State staff. The specific composition and level of State support will be determined once the vendor's proposals have been reviewed. This includes the leadership of the Program Office itself.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: PO automation tools

Question #: 332

Question: Has DHS obtained all necessary software tools to support the PO activities as outlined in Appendix E

Answer: The State has the following tools in-house or in the process of being acquired:

Requirements Management: Borland's Caliber/RM  
Incident Management: Serena Software's TeamTrack  
Project Reporting/Scheduling: Microsoft Project 2003  
Project Reporting/Status: Microsoft Office tools  
Configuration Management: IBM's Rational ClearCase.

As noted in the RFP, some flexibility is allowed to the vendors to recommend alternative tools for some of these categories, e.g. Project Reporting/Scheduling, Project Reporting/Status, etc., as well as for other tools not referenced, e.g. metrics repositories, et al.

Topic: Deliverable Acceptance

Question #: 341

Question: Attachment E Item 5 states "collect and consolidate status reports and schedules from all vendors. If the IV&V PO vendor made documented good faith effort to "collect" & or "consolidate" a participating vendors schedule, and was unable to obtain a schedule or consolidate due to errors in the schedule or such, is the IV&V PO vendor considered to have provided the IV&V PO on-going deliverable for the subject period of time?

Answer: Yes, so long as the omission is brought by the PO to the attention of the Program Manager ASAP.

Topic: Project Library deliverable

Question #: 351

Question: Attachment E Item \* states create and maintain, yet it is identified as a 1 time deliverable. Should this in fact be an on-going deliverable

Answer: Creation of the library is a one-time activity due one month after the signing of the contract. The "and ongoing" part of the due date field indicates that the maintenance of that Library is ongoing.

**Section: 3.5.2**

Topic: Key Staff

Question #: 358

Question: Does ND anticipate there be a key staff bid for each service component that will be full-time assigned to ND on-site?

Answer: Yes.

Due to the demands of a Project of this magnitude, it is unlikely that one individual would be able to serve effectively in key roles in, for example, both the PO and Verification Teams. Also, by definition, and Auditor should not have another role as it could result in that auditor auditing his/her own work.

For any service that does not require full-time, on-site presence, such as potentially the Audit function, the same Auditor(s) are to be allocated to this Project over the duration of the Project, unless approved in advance by the Program Manager.

**Section: 3.5.3**



**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Value Adding Services

Question #: 278

Question: General Question - Section 3.5.3, Page 21 of the RFP states that "the bidder is encouraged to recommend... additional activities that would add value to the project". Is it the State's intent that such value adding services would become subject to the hourly rate proposed for Consulting Services?

Answer: The State has gone to great lengths to ensure the implementation of industry standard "best practices" to help identify, mitigate and manage the risks inherent in a project of this magnitude and scope. In the event the State has overlooked activities, processes, etc., we expect the vendor(s) to be pro-active, and provide the State with their professional expertise based on work in similar situations to help address any omissions, inefficiencies or other detriments to this Project.

In the opinion of the State, IF such additional service is outside the scope of the Project, the State would issue the requisite change request and then the hourly consulting rate may be applicable.

**Section: 3.6**

Topic: Number of Copies of Deliverables - general

Question #: 353

Question: It states the bidder must provide a paper copy of each deliverable for each state team member identified. How many copies will this require or what is maximum?

Answer: The State will have five people reviewing the IV&V proposals.

**Section: 3.6.2**

Topic: Status & Earned Value Reporting

Question #: 279

Question: General Question - According to Section 3.6.2, Page 22, the bidder is expected to provide its weekly progress report to the DHS Project Manager by 9AM each Monday morning. As shown by Attachment H, this status report is intended to have the bidder's Earned Value reporting including all work through the Sunday immediately preceding the status report. Our accounting procedures require timesheets from a previous week to be submitted by Noon on the following Monday. Is the time for delivery of status reports flexible? Our time reporting cycle is also on a Saturday thru Friday basis, therefore any staff project time on the weekend immediately preceding a Monday status report would not be reported to our accounting department until the following Monday. Will the State be flexible regarding the time period for Earned Value reporting in the weekly status report?

Answer: It is not the State's intention to make life for the vendors' staff unduly difficult, as would be the case if multiple format/time period time sheets were required.

The due date and time of the status reports, as well as the precise nature of EVMS reporting by the vendors, is subject to change based on negotiated agreements among all vendors during the start-up activities of this Project.

The intent of the requirement is to indicate to all potential vendors the expectations of the State vis-a-vis rigorous status and management reporting.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Weekly vs. Monthly Status Reporting

Question #: 282

Question: General Question - For the Status Reporting activities in Attachments B, C, and D, the RFP lists "Weekly Status Reports" as the expected deliverables. However, according to Section 3.6.2 (Pages 22 and 23) and Attachment I (Page 52), bidders are to provide a "Monthly Status Report" as well. Attachment E identifies that the Project Office Activities contractor is responsible for a "Monthly Management Status Report", but does not mention weekly status reports. In the event that the IV&V activities are awarded to more than one vendor, is it the State's intent that the Project Office Activities contractor only produce Monthly Status Reports, while contractors for the other IV&V Activities are expected to only produce Weekly Status Reports?

Answer: All team leaders (including the Program Office team leader) are required to submit weekly status reports to the Program Office for consolidation into a single, Program-level report for the Program Manager, Program Director and Program Sponsor. The State expects this weekly status report to be at the team level, e.g. MMIS vendor team, Verification team, etc.

In addition, all team leaders are also required to submit a different format monthly management report, summarizing the month's progress, also by team, to the Program Office for consolidation into a single report for the Program Manager/Director/Sponsor and the Program's Steering Committee as well.

**Section: 3.7**

Topic: Cost Proposal

Question #: 354

Question: For deliverables that are on-going, how should cost be reflected in Attachment B-E?

Should it be a monthly cost or a total cost indicating the number of months based on or other?

Answer: The cost proposal for ongoing deliverables should be a total cost. A breakdown by month may be included for clarification if the vendor so desires.

**Section: 4**

Topic: Other Services

Question #: 280

Question: For the "Other Services", "Other Audit Services", and "Ongoing Support - Other Various Deliverables" line items in Attachments B, C, D, and E, please confirm whether these "deliverables" would be subject to the rate proposed for Consulting Services or if they would be subject to a fixed fee negotiated between DHS and the contractor at the time they are proposed for inclusion in the contract. If so, please also confirm that DHS does not expect a cost to be included for these line items in the Cost Proposal tables which resemble those Attachments.

Answer: If they are within the scope of the specific function, then they will be included in the original contract. If both the State and vendor agree that the "other services" are out of scope, then those services would be subject to the hourly consulting rate.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: "Updated Requirements"

Question #: 285

Question: In Attachment E, Pages 42-43, the RFP shows "Updated Requirements" as an ongoing deliverable for both the "Requirements Management" activity and the "Ongoing Support" activity. Please confirm that DHS expects bidders to only price this ongoing activity once and identify where this should be priced.

Answer: In the event that requirements are changed, added, or deleted, the Program Office is tasked with maintaining the central requirements repository. The State expects the vendors to price this in total based on some assumptions about the number and complexity of changes to the requirements repository.

The State assumes that this activity is (a) a non-labor intensive to the POI team, and (b) infrequently needed. If the vendor's experience on comparable projects is otherwise, the vendor is urged to state that and cost the activity appropriately.

Topic: DHS Incident Management Tool

Question #: 286

Question: According to Attachment B (Verification Activities), the successful bidder will "document requirements-based and project-based issues using the DHS Incident Management procedure and tool, and track to resolution". Attachment E (Project Office Activities) asks the Project Office vendor to "implement [an] automated process tool (for example, Serena TeamTrack) to provide project-wide support for [incident management] processes". Please confirm that DHS does not have an existing Incident Management tool in place and that the IV&V vendor(s) will be expected to conduct such tasks using a tool that is purchased and implemented by the IV&V Project Office Activities vendor. Secondly, please provide clarification whether the MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW vendors will also utilize this tool for Incident Management.

Answer: A draft incident management procedure for the entire Project has already been developed using industry best practices as a basis. The tool indicated in the RFP (Serena Software's TeamTrack) is currently being acquired by the State with a limited number of licenses for trial implementation.

If a vendor has positive experience with one or more alternative products that meet the specified needs for incident management, the vendor is welcome to recommend those products for use by the State for this Project. In all cases, the State will acquire the software licenses and install for use by the entire Project.

As a side note, the DDI vendors are required to use the Project's defined management processes, procedures and tools, although they may use alternatives only within their individual environments. For any work product (code, test script, issue, etc.) that leaves their own environment, it must use the Project's processes, procedures and tools.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Project Office - Support services for project management**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Electronic Project Library

Question #: 287

Question: The RFP identifies that the contracted vendor for Project Office Activities will be responsible for creating and maintaining an electronic Project Library for project documents and deliverables. Is it the State's intent to have work products from the IV&V vendor(s) reside on the State's server (for example, as a "Q Drive"), or is the State proposing that the Project Office Activities vendor implement a formal document management system? According to the Medicaid Systems Replacement RFP, the successful MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW vendor(s) are potentially each utilizing the latter form of Project Library for deliverable management. In the event that any combination of Verification Activities, Validation Activities, Audit Activities, and Project Office activities are contracted to separate vendors, it appears that the Verification, Validation, and Audit vendors would "deposit and maintain" their own deliverables to the Project Library established by the Project Office Activities vendor. Please confirm the overall intent of this requirement.

Answer: There will be one Electronic Project Library (EPL) for this Project. The DDI and IV&V vendors are asked to recommend a product (COTS preferred) that meets the needs of the Project. The State will select the most effective EPL solution, which may be COTS, in-house developed, or a combination of the two.

The Program Office has responsibility for defining the content of, and maintaining the EPL on an ongoing basis. ALL teams will use the same EPL for storage of designated work products, e.g. team status reports, updated documentation and training materials, and other work products specified for inclusion in the EPL.

At this time, the State has a rudimentary EPL using our web Project portal, which currently stores the RFPs, cover letters, etc. The State expects something more robust for the Project's EPL.

For audit and control purposes, the configuration management tool is a preferred storage solution to a shared network drive.

Topic: ClearCase

Question #: 289

Question: For the Configuration Management Activity, listed in Attachment E, DHS identifies that the Project Office Activities vendor will "install ClearCase and make [the software] operational". Will DHS be purchasing this software independently, or is the Project Office vendor expected to supply the software?

Answer: The State currently owns IBM's Rational ClearCase. All software approved for use on this Project will be licensed by the State, so the vendor will not be required to license the product.

Topic: CMRB and SCRB

Question #: 290

Question: DHS is establishing a Change Management Review Board (CMRB) and a Software Configuration Review Board (SCRB) for ongoing Requirements Management and Configuration Management. How often does DHS anticipate these Boards will be meeting?

Answer: These Boards will meet as required. The SCRB will be involved in all promotions and demotions, so its meeting schedule will be based on planned and actual promotion/demotion schedules.

The CMRB, now renamed the Incident Management Review Board (IMRB), will meet to review and monitor all incidents; as such it is assumed that this board will meet more frequently than the SCRB. The State assumes an IMRB frequency of no less than weekly, perhaps daily at certain stages of the Project.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**

**Section: 2.3.3**

Topic: Project resources

Question #: 335

Question: Can resource resumes for the project be representative resumes with a commitment for like experience upon awarding of contract?

Answer: The State's stipulated requirement is for resumes of the actual staff the vendor is committing to this Project. This is especially important as some of the Program Office services will start sooner than January 2006. If there is a specific need to change planned resources, such as for employee turnover, the vendor is expected to bring that to our attention at the earliest opportunity.

**Section: 2.3.4**

Topic: Project cost

Question #: 331

Question: Are we correct in understanding that the cost of the project is subject to change based upon changes in schedule and contingent factors from other parties, as well as detail yet to be defined?

Answer: The funding for this Project has been approved and set by the Federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Systems (CMS) and the North Dakota State Legislature. That funding was based, in part, on a stipulation that we complete the Project by April 2008. We cannot change the approved funding without additional review and allocations by these two parties. The next State Legislative session will not be until January 2007.

Although the State understands that the bidder's proposals will be estimates based upon assumptions, the State also assumes that the bidders have the requisite experience to estimate this Project within an acceptable margin of error for themselves and the State.

**Section: 3.2**

Topic: SDLC

Question #: 321

Question: Has the system vendor brought in an SDLC (testing phases) or will the State impose an SDLC?

Answer: No. However, the State used the Project Management Institute's Body of Knowledge (PMBok) and the Software Engineering Institute's (SEI) Capability Maturity Model Integrated (CMMI) to define the overall critical processes and high-level steps in those processes. Detailed specifics on "how" procedures will work are not yet completed, but are expected to be completed during (if not before) the start-up phase.

The State is also stipulating "frequent and numerous" builds from development to IV&V, and that those builds and the build schedule are defined in detail before the commencement of work.

The State expects each development vendor to use (and demonstrate the use of) effective, industry standard development processes. The State has also stipulated that the system (DDI) vendor must perform certain levels of testing before promotion to IV&V. Details within those the development and test processes is left to the individual vendors, but is expected to comply with industry standard concepts and activities.

**Section: 3.4.1**

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: state testing standards

Question #: 320

Question: Has the State developed its testing standards and procedures?

Answer: Although the State has some testing standards and procedures (S&P), these are typically at a team level, and not enterprise-wide. The successful bidder will be selected based upon that vendor's stated expertise in software quality and its ability to deliver the details of testing S&P to this Project's specific needs.

A secondary goal of this Project is to be able to hand-off critical policies, processes and procedures to the State's Enterprise Architecture group to provide the basis for developing enterprise-wide S&P. Testing is a part of this.

Topic: MMIS vendor testing

Question #: 322

Question: Will the system vendor be doing testing other than unit testing

Answer: The system (DDI) vendor(s) is responsible for what is described as unit, integration and system level testing in the DDI RFP. These are labels and are left to the DDI vendors to describe to the State how these are defined within their own environment in their proposals.

The DDI vendor(s) will have some involvement in the IV&V test levels, but are not responsible for them.

Topic: state staff support for testing

Question #: 323

Question: What level of testing support will State Medical Services staff provide?

Answer: A business team is dedicated to this Project, and will be available as a resource for verification test planning and execution, as well as issue resolution. The State business team will also be responsible for building and executing the validation tests, the general content of the training materials, and revisions to current Departmental policies, processes and procedures, with significant support and guidance by the vendor's validation team.

Topic: system vendor testing

Question #: 324

Question: Will the system vendor be conducting operational readiness testing (ORT), performance testing, and/or parallel testing? Will these testing phases be included in the contract?

Answer: Performance testing is a type of testing (as is regression testing) that is part of any testing toolkit, and will be integrated into all testing activities by the system (DDI) and IV&V vendors.

ORT is primarily the responsibility of the DDI vendor(s). However, the Validation team has a significant set of responsibilities, in that ORT cannot be completed until Validation has been completed, and the systems promoted to pre-production staging. In this effort, the State expects the Validation vendor to work closely with the development teams to ensure an effective and smooth process from Validation into ORT.

**Section: 3.4.2**

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Medical Services test case development resources

Question #: 317

Question: Attachment C Ref. #6 Test Artifact Development and Execution – Will Medical Services have resources available to assist in developing test cases? Will this task start before the requirements are prioritized and the build strategy defined?

Answer: The State is providing a business team dedicated to this Project. This team is the key resource for all business issues, as well as developing the deliverables for the validation efforts, with the assistance of the Validation vendor.

IN NO CASE will detail test planning or any other Project development activities occur before the requirements are prioritized, finalized, reviewed and approved by the State and all vendors. Equally, the build strategy will drive the scheduling of the development and IV&V efforts, and thus NO Detail development/IV&V activities will start until that Strategy has been finalized, reviewed and approved by the State and all vendors.

Topic: Current status of operations manuals

Question #: 318

Question: Attachment C Ref. #8 Business Operations Review – The deliverable is revised Medical Services policies, processes and procedures. Are there documents that contain the policies, processes and procedures? Do they reflect the current state of the system? This has a planned due date of 1 month after signing of the contract. How can this start before requirements are defined? How can it be completed before the systems are designed?

Answer: Please refer to the answer for question #334.

This activity refers to the review of the current business materials (as opposed to step #4 which refers to the current computer system and operations) and beginning the planning for the future use of the new Medicaid systems. The RFP Amendment will address changing the deliverables for the "implementing" clause to "ongoing".

Topic: training delivery

Question #: 327

Question: Has DHS selected a training delivery method (web based, instructor led, CBT, etc.)?

Answer: Training requirements are laid out in the DDI RFP. The principle method is web-based, with CBT for specific topics.

Although the DDI vendors have the primary responsibility for developing the training materials, the Validation vendor is responsible for supporting the deployment of that training during the Validation activities, and supporting the business efforts during deployment of the training in Pilot and full production roll-out.

Topic: Current Business Environment

Question #: 334

Question: Is the current business environment, policies, processes and procedures, workflows and forms documented or does the IV&V vendor need to gather this information?

Answer: The current environment is documented, although there will be some areas in which information is either missing, or obsolete due to changes within the business practices. The Validation vendor is expected to identify and resolve those areas needing additional definition.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Certification Support

Question #: 336

Question: It is stated that the IV&V vendor is to support the CMS certification process. Attachment C states the IV & V vendor must provide direction to DHS during the CMS visit. In the amended Attachment K posted the schedule has the certification visit start/finish as 10/29/08 - 11/4/08 with a Go Live of 4/24/08.

Item 12 of Attachment C has a due date of within 6 months of deployment, and 11/4 is more than 6 months from deployment. Please clarify or provide correct due date for item 12.

In addition, there is often some follow-up by CMS from the certification site visit where the state may be asked to provide some additional material/clarification.

Support for certification is included as part of validation services - Attachment K has a finish date for IV&V validation phase as 4/24/08 and IV&V certification tasks finish date of 9/30/08. If validation services includes IV&V support and direction during the site visit, please clarify if the finish date for validation services is 11/4/08 or sometime later?

What certification support is

Answer: The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Systems (CMS) requires a minimum of 6 months of production operation BEFORE they will conduct a certification visit. The State plans for the Medicaid systems to go live 4/24/08; six months later is 10/24/08; the certification visits by CMS normally last 2 weeks. The certification support task is changed to complete at the end of the certification visit, 11/4/08.

Topic: Overall Project Schedule Define

Question #: 339

Question: What overall project schedule is Item 1 of Attachment C referring to, the overall including all DDI schedules and all IV&V schedules?

Answer: This requirement stipulates the integration of Validation activities into the master schedule used by Program Management to monitor this Project. The Master Schedule will include ALL Project activities and tasks, integrated across ALL teams and vendors. No one team/vendor will drive the scheduling for the Project; all vendors/teams are required by the State to work with all other vendors/teams to ensure that the Project's activities and schedule are well-integrated and everyone agrees with that schedule.

Topic: Training materials and delivery clarification

Question #: 344

Question: Attachment C Ref. #7 Training Support – This indicates the Validation team will work with Medical Services on training. Will the Validation team be responsible for creating the training materials? Who will be responsible for conducting the training?

Answer: Training materials will be developed by the system or DDI vendors. The role of the Validation team is to put those materials to use, ensure that they meet the needs of the Project business team, make the materials ready for production deployment, and identify any defects in the material for correction by the author(s).

Training is planned to be web-based and CBT, and unless otherwise stated in the DDI RFP will not require a formal instructor.



**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Training Delivery

Question #: 345

Question: Support of development & implementation of training is required in 3.4.2. Attachment C Item 7 has a training plan and training materials as deliverables. They are indicated as 1 time deliverables. The planned due date for these deliverables states Weekly and Monthly Status Reports. Please clarify this does not seem logical for 1 time deliverables.

Is there an on-going deliverable missing from item 7?

Who is responsible for delivery of training of Medical Services staff on the use and operation of the new MMIS?

Answer: An RFP Amendment will be issued to change the planned due date for Attachment C, number 7, to "To be determined during the Planning activities". The frequency of training materials will be changed to "ongoing".

The word "Support" is used because training materials will be developed by the DDI Teams, and will be utilized by the Validation Team in their Validation activities. As with the Medicaid Systems, defects with the training materials will be sent back to development for correction.

For the delivery question, please refer to the answer to question #344.

Topic: Training Metrics/Logistics

Question #: 346

Question: 3.4.2 states support of training is this just Medical Services staff training or also provider training?

How many users are expected to be trained and where will the training occur?

Answer: Provider training will need to be tested before deployment; it is the responsibility of the Validation Team to ensure that the State staff validates this training effectively. The materials are self-directed and CBT, so no formal classroom provider training is planned.

Please refer to the answer to question #345 for training requirements and facilities.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Test Execution

Question #: 349

Question: Is the IV&V vendor responsible for execution of test artifacts or for support of Medical Services staff executing or both? Please clarify.

Attachment C Item 6 identifies testing responsibility to be for validating requirements included in super builds. Please define a super build vs a non-super build and identify the expected number and magnitude of super builds.

Answer: "Best practices" in Validation require the business people to develop and execute the tests that help them confirm that they can continue to run the business with the new system, policies, processes and procedures. The Validation vendor is expected to help them accomplish this whatever that requires.

A super build is a collection of one or more builds that is appropriate for a business user to actually test the business against.

A build is simply a defined set of requirements; during development a number of builds may be defined that include infrastructure, operational, or other technical requirements that are invisible to the business user. By combining these essentially technical requirements with business requirements that represent a more complete business process, the business user can validate that set of requirements against the business and any business process changes.

The number of super builds will be determined during the build definition process in the DDI start-up phase of this Project. The number of super builds is assumed to be somewhat less than the number of builds defined.

**Section: 4**

Topic: Certification Support Deliverables

Question #: 281

Question: According to Attachment C, Page 39 of the RFP, the Validation Activities bidder will price and ultimately produce "Certification deliverables" on a one-time basis as part of its services. Has the State identified specific deliverables that the Validation Activities contractor is responsible for, or is oversight of the MMIS contractor's certification deliverables the primary concern here?

Answer: The vendor is required to work with the State in preparing and ensuring the delivery of information required by the staff from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Systems (CMS) when they are on-site to conduct the certification. The task is labeled "Certification SUPPORT" (emphasis added) to reflect the fact that the State is looking for the Validation vendor to provide oversight and assistance to the State to ensure a successful certification - one of the Project's primary goals.

Topic: Risk Identification for Validation

Question #: 291

Question: In Attachment C - Validation Activities, the Risk Identification task shows its deliverable "Documented risks and mitigation approaches" as being a one-time deliverable within a month of the start of the IV&V contract. In Attachment B - Verification Activities, the Verification vendor is asked to provide a similar service to DHS but the similar deliverable is shown as an Ongoing deliverable throughout the contract. Is the Risk Identification activity for the Validation vendor truly meant to provide a one-time deliverable?

Answer: An Amendment to the IV&V RFP will change this deliverable to an ongoing deliverable.

**RFP 325-05-10-018 Independent Verification and Validation**  
**Validation - User acceptance testing and related user support**  
**Final Questions and Answers**

---

Topic: Test Artifact Development & Execution Deliverables

Question #: 292

Question: For the "Test Artifact Development and Execution" activity conducted by the Validation vendor (Attachment C), the ongoing deliverables (Test Artifacts, Execution results, Defects, and Issues) all show a Planned Due Date of "1 month after the start of the start-up phase of the IV&V contract. For the similar activity in Attachment B for the Verification vendor, the ongoing deliverables have a Planned Due Date of "Ongoing, beginning within 1 month of the start of Test Scenario Development". Please clarify what the deliverables expectations are for the vendor providing Validation Activities services.

Answer: An IV&V RFP Amendment will be issued to change the due date to "ongoing".

Topic: Training Support Deliverables

Question #: 293

Question: For the "Training Support" activity conducted by the Validation vendor (Attachment C), the two one-time deliverables show a Planned Due Date of "Weekly and Monthly Status Reports". We are assuming that DHS' intent would be to have the Training Plan deliverable submitted within the first 6 months of the project and that Training Materials would have a staggered delivery depending upon the progress of the MMIS, POS, and DSS/DW development efforts. Please advise on the anticipated schedule for these work products.

Answer: Please refer to the answer to question #345.

Topic: Business Operations Review Deliverables

Question #: 294

Question: For the "Business Operations Review" activity conducted by the Validation vendor (Attachment C), it appears that the planned due date is a typographical error. The intended deliverable for this activity is "Revised Medical Services policies, processes, and procedures" applicable to the use and operation of the new MMIS. The listed Planned Due Date is "1 month after signing of the contract". In November 2005, none of the implementation vendors will be contracted yet. Is this deliverable more appropriately listed as a one-time deliverable much later in the project (e.g., during testing)?

Answer: An Amendment to the IV&V RFP will be issued to change the due date to "1 month after the start of Validation activities". That same amendment calls for the start of Program Office support in late October 2005, with the remainder of the IV&V services (including Validation) to start in January 2006.